



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/971,946

10/04/2001

Jean-Patrick Azpitarte

01-600

4092

7590

03/17/2008

Barry L. Kelmachter
BACHMAN & LaPOINTE, P.C.
Suite 1201
900 Chapel Street
New Haven, CT 06510-2802

EXAMINER

CHANKONG, DOHM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2152

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/971,946	Applicant(s) AZPITARTE, JEAN-PATRICK	
	Examiner DOHM CHANKONG	Art Unit 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13 and 15-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13 and 15-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1> This action is in response to Applicant's request for continued examination. Claim 13 is amended. Claims 13 and 15-25 are presented for further examination.

2> Since Applicant's amendments are directed at purely cosmetic alterations and do not affect the substance of any of the claims, the rejections set forth in the final rejection filed on 9/9/2005 are maintained. This is a first action final rejection. See MPEP §706.07(b).

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3> A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/6/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2152

4> Claims 13 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spira et al, U.S Patent Publication No. 2003|0172002 [“Spira”].

5> As to claim 13, Spira is discloses a system for remotely and automatically controlling, by a facilities management company, maintenance of facilities by a maintenance company with regards to the contract binding the maintenance company to the facilities management company [0019, 0111], said system comprising:

local monitoring units, each local monitoring unit being installed in close proximity to at least one piece of said facilities and associated thereto [0022, 0037, 0041, 0121 : locally installed modules enable online monitoring], each local monitoring unit comprising:

means for measuring operation parameters of the associated piece of facilities for detecting an operational state thereof [0231, 0354 : “integrated sensors...collect measurements continuously”],

a transmission network [0022 : “communication connection”], and

means for transmitting through said transmission network said detected operational state of said associated piece of facilities [0121, 0354];

a first and a second computer, each being connected to the local monitoring units through said transmission network and comprising means for receiving and processing said detected operational state [0055, 0112]; and

means for storing all information transmitted by the local monitoring units said first computer being available to the maintenance company and is used to manage the maintenance of said facilities, and said second computer being available to the facilities

Art Unit: 2152

management company and is used to automatically control the maintenance and repair tasks performed by the technicians of said maintenance company on said facilities with regards to their contractual obligations [0036, 0055, 0252, 0256, 0258 where : Spira discloses his Computerized Maintenance Managements system implemented at both the customer system and the provider center (maintenance company). He further discloses the customer has substantial control over the operations of the maintenance company through the use of modules, the substance of the maintenance company's work defined in part by the selection of the modules as well as the performance requirements of the agreed upon contract].

Spira discloses a control means to track technicians during their maintenance and the repair tasks performed, said control means being independent from the operational state of the associated piece of facilities [0258, : "program management module ... provides a focal point for the information management, improved tracking and reporting of performance..."] but does not expressly disclose that the means allows a maintenance technician to real-time notify the start and the end time of his maintenance.

However, Spira further discloses a maintenance protocol for reviewing the quality of maintenance work including reviewing such performance indicators like maintenance actions, frequency of work, duration of work and by entering new equipment items [0139]. Thus, because of Spira's disclosure of being able to review maintenance actions and the duration of work, there is an implied ability to track the start and end time of the work [in order to be able to determine the work's duration] as well as the repair tasks performed during the maintenance by the repairman [maintenance actions].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the ability

Art Unit: 2152

to monitor start and end times of a maintenance job along with any repair tasks performed in Spira. Spira's maintenance review capability and in particular the ability to monitor the maintenance actions and duration of work provides an obvious motivation to suggest such functionality would be required and implicit in his embodiments. Furthermore, the ability to track and monitor a technician's work in Spira's maintenance services would enable both customer and the maintenance company to evaluate the performance according to the agreed upon indicators as defined within the contract [0019].

6> As to claim 15, Spira does not explicitly disclose the system wherein each said local monitoring unit for preventing the first and second computers from sending information relating to malfunctions and failures detected between the start and the end of said inspection and signaled using said control means.

7> However, the functionality to prevent transmissions of malfunctions during the inspection is well known in the art for providing the benefit of preventing sending redundant or false alarms on failures which the technician is there to repair. This functionality is analogous to a technician taking equipment offline so that appropriate repairs can be made; thus claim 15 is directed towards automating a process that is normally manually performed by a technician during the normal course of his repairs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the transmission prevention functionality into Reid's maintenance system to allow technicians to prevent redundant transmissions or even power down network connections so he can properly work and fix the

Art Unit: 2152

faults. Further, automating a process that was once manually performed involves only routine skill in the art and does not provide patentable distinction over the prior art. *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192.

8> As to claim 16, Spira discloses each of said first and second computers is connected to a database collecting all information relating to the facilities and maintenance thereof, and the information transmitted by said local monitoring units [0124, 0357].

9> As to claim 17, Spira discloses the system wherein the first and second computers comprise:

means for counting a number of maintenance tasks carried out for each piece of said facilities during a first period of time, for comparing said maintenance task number to a first threshold [0019, 0139 where : Spira clearly indicates reviewing frequency of work and a mutual interest by both parties to evaluate the maintenance operations in comparison with “performance indicators” to determine the effectiveness. Thus it would be obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to have reasonably inferred that the performance indicators refer to the maintenance tasks described throughout Spira’s disclosure];

means for computing a total duration of the maintenance tasks performed on each piece of said facilities during a second period of time, for comparing said total duration to a second threshold [0019, 0139];

means for computing an elapsed time between a time when piece of facilities is detected as malfunctioning and the start time of a repair task on said piece of facilities, for

Art Unit: 2152

comparing said elapsed time with a third threshold [0019, 0164, 0348 : “time limit which is stipulated”]; and

means for computing a restart time to put a piece of said facilities to a normal operational state after the start time of a repair task on said piece of facilities with a fourth threshold [0019, 0139, 0140, 0258].

Spira does not expressly disclose displaying a fault signal when the items exceed their thresholds. However, such functionality is obvious in light of Spira’s disclosure of:

“key performance indicators are generated for each customer to permit both the provider and receiver of the services to evaluate the effectiveness of the provided services” [0019]; and

“Historical data is reviewed, failure analysis is reviewed. A review is made of safety issues, employ statistical techniques to evaluation frequency of work and employ reliability engineering techniques to evaluate design out requirements” [0139].

Spira is clearly motivated to provide a symbiotic relationship between customer manager and maintenance and ensuring the quality of the maintenance operations as defined by the maintenance contract, illustrated by the performance indicators and monitoring and evaluation of the maintenance work disclosed throughout his specification.

As the display of alarms or “fault signals” when thresholds are met are well known in the art, their implementation into Spira’s review and evaluation process of the maintenance operations would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The fault signals or alarms would be a benefit to customers in aiding the evaluation of the maintenance company’s work and ensuring that they meet the performance indicators.

10> As to claim 18, Spira does not disclose computing penalties if a maintenance fault concerning the exceeding of one of the four thresholds have been detected by second computer. However, as discussed in the previous paragraph, Spira discusses utilizing performance indicators to evaluate effective of the maintenance. Further, Spira discloses that bonus|penalty principles are well known in the art [0005].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate penalties into Spira's maintenance system to enable customers to enforce the contract agreed upon between the customer and maintenance company; the concept of enforcing a contract and issuing reprimands based on the limitations of the contract are well known in the art.

11> As to claim 19, Spira discloses the first and second thresholds are set as a function of said facilities [0137], and wherein the third and fourth thresholds are defined as a function of the detected malfunction or type of repair [0137, 0138], the thresholds being defined by the maintenance contract binding the maintenance company to the managing company [0019 | 0047, 0137].

12> Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spira, in view of Petite et al, U.S Patent No. 6.437.692 ["Petite"].

13> As to claim 20, Spira discloses the system according to claim 13, wherein transmissions between the local monitoring units and the first and second computers are

Art Unit: 2152

carried out through a basic wire or radio telephone network [0022] but does not disclose wherein the local monitoring units further comprises for setting-up a link between the local monitoring units and the first and second computers through a radio telephone network , when the local monitoring units cannot access a basic telephone network.

14> Petite discloses the local monitoring units further comprises for setting-up a link between the local monitoring units and the first and second computers through a radio telephone network , when the local monitoring units cannot access a basic telephone network [column 11 «line 58» to column 12 «line 3» | claim 11]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated Petite's backup links into Spira. One would have been motivated to perform such an implementation as backup network connections provide backup when primary means of connection fails. Such a method is well known and expected in the art.

15> As to claim 21, Spira discloses wherein at least one local monitoring unit of a group of said local monitoring units which are installed close from one another comprises a data transmission unit, wherein said data transmission unit comprises means for transmission over the basic telephone network and means for transmission over the radio telephone network, and wherein other local monitoring units of the site comprising means for connection to said data transmission unit [Figure 2 | 0121, 0134, 0143 where Spira's modules perform the monitoring and communicate with the maintenance company any detected maintenance information].

16> Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spira and Petite, in further view of Johnson et al, U.S Patent No. 6,553,336 [“Johnson”].

17> Spira does not specifically disclose the radio telephone network transmission means in the data transmission unit are provided with a backed-up power supply for sending a power supply fault message when the local monitoring unit is no longer powered.

18> Johnson discloses a radio telephone network transmission means in the data transmission unit are provided with a backed-up power supply for sending a power supply fault message when the local monitoring unit is no longer powered [column 15 «lines 47-53»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Johnson’s power supply monitoring functionality into Spira’s remote monitoring system, and in particular his monitoring modules (hardware and software) to allow the monitoring unit to keep running if the primary power supply fails.

19> Spira does not disclose his local monitoring units comprising a means for detecting internal faults.

20> Johnson discloses local monitoring units comprising means for detecting internal faults pertaining to operation of said local monitoring unit, and means for sending malfunction information to a third computer if such internal faults are detected, said third

Art Unit: 2152

computer being connected to local monitoring units through said transmission network and comprising means for receiving and processing and storing into a database the internal malfunction information transmitted by the local monitoring units [column 15 «line 47» to column 16 «line 24»].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Johnson's local monitoring unit detection system into Spira. Such a system would provide a layer of fault detection not presently found in Spira. The ability for the maintenance company to monitor the local monitoring units provides a common-sense benefit to detect if any problems are occurring with their local modules and enable faster repairs.

21> Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spira, in view of Whynacht, U.S Patent No. 4,568,909.

22> As to claim 24, Spira does utilizing a timer [0348] but not the timers as claimed.

23> Whynacht discloses a system wherein each of said local monitoring units comprises:
means for starting a first timer after a malfunction has been detected on the associated facility [column 21 «line 56» to column 22 «line 6»];

means for starting a second timer if the first timer has timed out without the corresponding fault having disappeared [column 22 «lines 46-55»];

means for sending a malfunction message to the first and second computers if the second timer has timed out without the corresponding fault having disappeared [column 22 «lines 10-15»];

means for starting a third timer after a fault has disappeared [column 24 «lines 55-66»]; and

means for transmitting a fault disappearance message if the third timer has timed out without the corresponding fault reoccurring [Figures 14, 15 | column 25 «lines 1-24» where: Whynacht's "Return to Normal" message is analogous to a fault disappearance message].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Whynacht's timers into Spira to increase the functionality of Spira's remote monitoring system. One would have been motivated to perform such an implementation to insure that the alarm conditions in the system are proper alarm conditions and not false alarms, thereby minimizing costs of sending out maintenance engineers to the facilities [see Whynacht, column 22 «lines 46-55» | column 23 «lines 4-6»].

24> As to claim 25, Spira does not disclose the system wherein a respective duration for each of the first, second and third timers is determined independently from each other as a function of each malfunction type.

25> Whynacht discloses a system wherein a respective duration for each of the first, second and third timers is determined independently from each other as a function of each malfunction type [column 21 «line 56» to column 23 «line 27» | column 24 «lines 55-67»]. It

Art Unit: 2152

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Whynacht's varying timers into Spira to take into account the various malfunctions that may occur in the monitored devices.

Conclusion

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2152


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOHM CHANKONG whose telephone number is (571)272-3942. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday [8:30 AM to 4:30 PM].

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571.272.3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dohm Chankong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2152
(temporary partial signatory authority)

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152

<div><i>Application Number</i></div> <div></div>	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination	
	09/971,946	AZPITARTE, JEAN-PATRICK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DOHM CHANKONG	2152	